



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/788,611

02/21/2001

Richard Carr

1330.1089

4560

21171

7590

10/06/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

GART, MATTHEW S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/788,611
Filing Date: February 21, 2001
Appellant(s): CARR ET AL.

Paul I. Kravetz
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed September 6, 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed February 6, 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,950,809

Dahan

3-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 29, 30-31, 73-74, 93-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dahan (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,809).

Referring to claim 1. Dahan discloses a method comprising:

- Dynamically maintaining a plurality of organizational profiles containing integration preferences, a plurality of users each being associated with a particular organizational profile (Dahan: column 4, line 51 to column 5, line 2); and
- Providing an executable on a shared executable hosted e-procurement system, the executable being shared by the plurality of users to implement user requested transactions of the plurality of

users (Dahan: column 5, lines 6-15), the executable implementing a respective user requested transaction by a respective user and implementing the integration preferences contained in the accessed organizational profile (Dahan: column 5, lines 16-23), wherein the integration preferences contained in a respective organizational profile determine how the shared hosted e-procurement system interacts with the application system for the respective organizational profile or for the users associated with the respective organizational profile, to thereby implement user requested transactions via the executable on the shared executable hosted e-procurement system (Dahan: column 5, lines 38-43).

Referring to claim 4. Dahan further discloses a method wherein the application system is a financial system (Dahan: column 5, lines 38-43).

Referring to claim 6. Claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claims 1 and 4. Furthermore, Dahan discloses a method comprising dynamically maintaining a plurality of organizational profiles containing data definitions, which define data fields required to implement user requested transactions (Dahan: Fig. 3, "320").

Referring to claims 29-30. Claims 29-30 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claims 1 and 4.

Referring to claim 31. Dahan further discloses a method wherein a financial system is a system used to track and manage financial resources (Dahan: column 5, lines 16-23).

Referring to claim 73. Claim 73 is rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claims 1 and 4.

Referring to claim 74. Claim 74 is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in claims 1, 4 and 6.

Referring to claim 93. Claim 93 is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in claims 1, 4 and 6.

Referring to claim 94. Claim 94 is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in claims 1, 4 and 6.

Art Unit: 3625

Referring to claim 95. Claim 95 is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in claims 1, 4 and 6.

Referring to claim 96. Dahan further discloses a method wherein the integration preferences include encumbrance and payment preferences (Dahan: column 5, lines 44-48).

Referring to claim 97. Dahan further discloses a method wherein the integration preferences include encumbrance and payment preferences (Dahan: column 5, lines 44-48).

Referring to claims 98-99. Claims 98-99 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claims 1, 4 and 6.

Referring to claim 100. Claim 100 is rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claims 1, 4 and 6.

(10) Response to Argument

- Rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, 29-31, 73-74 and 93-100 under 35 U.S.C. 102(2) as being anticipated by Dahan (US Patent No. 6,950,809).

The Appellant argues that Dahan does not disclose dynamically maintaining organizational profiles containing integration preferences, where the integration preferences contained in a respective organization profile determine how the shared executable hosted e-procurement system interacts with the application system for the respective organization profile or for the users associated with the respective organization profile.

The Examiner notes, the specification as originally filed defines an integration preference as a business rule that is typically used to determine how a user may interact with an application system. For example, an integration preference may specify a payment option to be used for a purchase (Specification: Detailed Description Paragraph 0057 and 0075). Dahan discloses a method for facilitating a transaction in electronic commerce. The method allows a buyer and a seller to exchange information, such as their respective credentials, while a transaction is in progress (Dahan: column 4, lines 10-15)

Referring to Fig. 1 of Dahan, in step **110**, the method identifies a first party to the transaction from a digital identifier. In step **115**, the method extracts a profile identifier of the first party from the digital identifier. In a complete transaction involving multiple parties, the method extracts a profile identifier from the digital identifier of each

respective party. The profile identifier, which is embedded in the digital identifier by the issuer of the digital identifier, uniquely identifies a business entity with which a party is affiliated. In step **120**, the method retrieves data from a database based on the profile identifier. That is, the profile identifier is used to access a database to retrieve information about the party. In a case where the party of interest is an individual, the retrieved information can include individual rights, roles and privileges.

FIG. 2 of Dahan shows additional features that are contemplated to enhance the basic method as shown in FIG. 1. The enhancements begin with step **210**. In step **210**, the method makes a decision regarding the transaction based on a rule applied to the data that was retrieved in step **120**. The method utilizes a rules engine to execute business logic rules to arrive at the decision. For example, the rules can be applied to analyze the credentials of the parties and make a recommendation regarding how a user may interact within an e-commerce system, i.e. an integration preference.

Further notable, the method of Dahan can be utilized to designate that a particular individual is authorized to act on behalf of a particular entity. The profile identifier for an individual, such as an email address, can be used to determine individual rights, roles and privileges (Dahan: column 6, lines 30-40).

The Appellant argues that Dahan does not disclose or suggest a shared executable hosted e-procurement system that interacts with a plurality of financial systems, and that integration preferences determine how the shared executable hosted e-procurement system interacts with the respective financial systems as recited.

The Examiner notes, Dahan discloses a shared executable hosted e-procurement system that interacts with a plurality of financial systems. In Dahan a profile identifier is used to establish links to additional databases or other data sources such as, for example (1) uniform resource locator (URL) addresses, (2) digital certificate revocation lists, (3) customer identification/account numbers within enterprises, and (4) membership/association lists of selected industry groups, standards bodies, and accrediting organizations (Dahan: column 4, line 51 to column 5, line 2). A data source such as (3) would constitute in its broadest sense a financial system. Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of the specification" without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily).

Furthermore, Table 1, column 5 of Dahan shows a method that delivers data to at least an external regional credit department (i.e., financial system) in order to determine credit worthiness. The system of Dahan is operable to interact with a

Art Unit: 3625

plurality of credit departments, each credit department receiving inquiries from a particular geographic region.

The Appellant argues that Dahan does not disclose or suggest transmission of data fields.

The Examiner notes, user template data **438** is a user-defined data source that allows a user to define variables that are used during evaluation of a rule by rules engine **435**. More than one user template may exist. The values of the variables in a user-defined template may be modified at run-time through a configuration tool, which effectively allows a user to enter values for the fields in a form (Dahan: column 9, lines 1-14).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew S Gart
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3625

Conferees:



Jeffrey Smith
SPE
Art Unit 3625

John Weiss
Appeals Conference Specialist
Tech Center 3600

